

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 SHAWN PRITCHETT,

4 Plaintiff

5 v.

6 NGUYEN & LAY ATTORNEYS AT LAW,  
7 and ESQ. ROCHELLE NGUYEN,

8 Defendants

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00410-APG-BNW

**Order Accepting Report and  
Recommendation and Dismissing Case**

[ECF No. 4]

9 On March 12, 2025, Magistrate Judge Weksler recommended that I dismiss plaintiff  
10 Shawn Pritchett's complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. ECF No. 4. Pritchett did not  
11 object. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation.  
12 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to "make a de novo determination of those  
13 portions of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made"); *United States*  
14 *v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("the district judge must review  
15 the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not  
16 otherwise" (emphasis in original)).

17 I THEREFORE ORDER that Magistrate Judge Weksler's report and recommendation  
18 (ECF No. 4) is accepted, and plaintiff Shawn Pritchett's complaint (ECF No. 1-1) is dismissed  
19 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Pritchett is denied leave to amend in this case, but the  
20 dismissal is without prejudice to Pritchett pursuing his claims in state court. The clerk of court is  
21 instructed to close this case.

22 DATED this 3rd day of April, 2025.

23   
ANDREW P. GORDON  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE